



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

TS

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

08/928,861 09/12/97 NEYMAN

I P3251

┌
DONALD R BOYS
P O BOX 187
AROMAS CA 95004

LM02/0524

┐
EXAMINER

HOOSAIN, A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2748

DATE MAILED: 05/24/00

13

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.
08/928,861

Applicant(s)
Neyman, et al.

Examiner
Allan Hoosain

Group Art Unit
2748



☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Preamendment D, 2/29/2000

☐ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 35 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claim

☒ Claim(s) 2-10 and 12-18 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 2-10 and 12-18 is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some* ☒ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been

☐ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

— SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES —

Art Unit: 2748

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claim 1 recites the limitation "the specific set of current routing rules" in step (c). There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim which only recites "a set of routing rules specific to".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371© of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

4. Claims 2-8, 10 and 12-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by **Andrews et al.** (US Patent 5,848,143).

Art Unit: 2748

As to Claim 2, with respect to Figures 1-3 and 9-11, **Andrews et al.** teach a method for routing Internet Protocol Network Telephony (IPNT) calls at Agent Systems, 402, (customer premises) having a managing processor, Figure 10, labels 473, 476 and 470, and a computer workstation, Figure 10, label 482, coupled to managing processor, the managing processor having a set of routing rules specific to and accessible and editable by a user (person) assigned to the computer workstation, the method comprising steps of:

- a) receiving an incoming IPNT call at the managing processor (Figure 10, label 480 and Col. 12, lines 11-18);
- b) determining the user (person) assigned to the workstation is an intended recipient for the call (Col. 12, lines 20-46);
- c) requesting routing by the managing processor from the specific set of current routing rules accessible and editable by the user (person) assigned to the computer workstation (Col. 12, lines 11-18 and Col. 13, lines 22-43); and
- d) routing the call according to the current routing rules specific to the user (person) (Col. 12, lines 11-18).

As to Claims 3,17, in addition to the information above, **Andrews et al.** further teach the method of Claim 2 wherein the editable routing rules specific to the user (person) are maintained at the computer workstation (Col. 13, lines 35-43).

Art Unit: 2748

As to Claims 4,14,18, in addition to the information above, **Andrews et al.** further teach the method of Claim 2 wherein the editable routing rules for the intended recipient are maintained on a central client-server router, 480, executed on a processor (Col. 12, lines 11-27).

As to Claims 5,15, in addition to the information above, **Andrews et al.** further teach the method of Claim 4 wherein the processor is the managing processor for the call center (Col. 12, lines 11-27).

As to Claims 6,12,16, in addition to the information above, **Andrews et al.** further teach the method of Claim 4 wherein the processor executing the client-server router is a processor separate from the managing processor (Figure 10, labels 480 and 470).

As to Claim 7, in addition to the information above, **Andrews et al.** further teach the method of Claim 2 comprising a step executed by the person for editing the routing rules via an interactive Graphical User Interface (GUI) executing on the intended recipient's computer workstation (Col. 13, lines 35-43 and Figure 11, label 452).

As to Claim 8, in addition to the information above, **Andrews et al.** further teach the method of Claim 4 wherein there are multiple workstations coupled to the managing processor, and the client-server router has router-rule portions dedicated to individual ones of agents at individual

Art Unit: 2748

ones of the computer workstations, and wherein an individual agent, through a graphical user interface executing on a computer workstation to which the agent is assigned, may access the portion dedicated to that agent, and edit the routing rules therein (Col. 12, lines 11-27 and Col. 13, lines 35-43).

As to Claim 10, with respect to Figures 1-3 and 9-11, **Andrews et al.** teach in an agent system (customer premises Internet Protocol Telephony Call Center) having a managing processor, Figure 10, 470, 473 and 476, including sets of routing rules specific to users (individual agents) at workstations, Figure 10, label 482, the managing processor for switching received calls to individual ones of the connected users (agents) at computer workstations, a method for individual customization of routing rules for received calls, comprising steps of:

- (a) executing a client user interface on one of the computer workstations by an user (agent) at the station (Figure 11, label 452 and Col. 13, lines 35-43);
- (b) determining routing for the received calls addressed to the computer workstation at the computer workstation by the user (agent) at the workstation by the user (agent) at the workstation using the client user interface (Col. 13, lines 22-35);
- (c) transmitting the routing determination to central controller (a router) executing on the managing processor (Col. 13, lines 28-35); and
- (d) routing the received telephone calls by the central controller (router) according to the transmitted routing determination (Col. 12, lines 11-18).

Art Unit: 2748

As to Claim 13, with respect to Figures 1-3 and 9-11, **Andrews et al.** teach a call router system, Figure 9, label 30A, for determining routing of incoming Internet Protocol Network Telephony calls in an agent system, Figure 9, label 402, (customer premises call center) including a managing processor, Figure 10, labels 470, 473 and 476, connected to individual computer workstations, Figure 10, label 482, the managing processor having sets of routing rules specific to individual agents, the router system comprising:

(a) client user interface, Figure 11, label 452, executable on one of the computer workstations, and adapted to provide functions for editing routing rules for individual users (agents) (Col. 13, lines 35-43); and

(b) a router, Figure 9, label 30A and Figure 10, label 470, listing current routing rules specific to the user (agent) at the workstation (Col. 12, lines 11-18);

(c) wherein the client user interface is adapted to transmit agent-edited routing rules to the router (Col. 13, lines 29-35), and

the router is adapted to provide routing to incoming calls addressed to the user (agent) according to the current routing rules (Col. 12, lines 11-18 and Col. 11, lines 60-67).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are

Art Unit: 2748

such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

6. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Andrews et al.** in view of **McCalmont et al.** (US Patent 5,621,789) and further in view of **Brewster et al.** (US Patent 5,870,464).

As to claim 9, in addition to the information above, **Andrews et al.** further teach the method of claim 8 wherein the user interface comprises a graphical user interface (GUI) having workstation capabilities, but not icons indicating telephone calls received, and for forwarding calls (choices of disposition) of calls received, and including steps for an agent to place outgoing calls (precipitate actions in call routing) by requests but not by iconic drag-and-drop procedures (Col. 13, lines 29-50).

Art Unit: 2748

Andrews et al. teach workstation capabilities for call routing and thereby suggests having icons indicating number of calls received and iconic drag-and-drop procedures for placing a call (Col. 13, lines 29-35 and 43-50). **McCalmont et al.** teach a workstation with telephone calls received capability (Figure 5b and Col. 6, lines 40-48). **Brewster et al.** teach a workstation with iconic drag-and-drop capability (Col. 26, lines 48-60). Since **Andrews et al.**, **McCalmont et al.** and **Brewster et al.** are in analogous workstation activities, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to add the call receiving capability of **McCalmont et al.**'s invention and the drag-and-drop capability of **Brewster et al.**'s invention to the workstation capability of **Andrews et al.**'s invention for a workstation to show number of calls received and have drag-and-drop capability.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicants' arguments with respect to claims 2-10 and 12-18 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Reynolds et al. (US Patent 5,452,350) teach a call routing system which routes calls to ACD resources using AIN processing.

Art Unit: 2748

Strauss et al. (US Patent 5,729,594) teach a method for processing incoming calls and routing calls over the Internet.

Wise et al. (US Patent 5,884,262) teach routing of calls over the Internet AIN IP processing.

9. **Any response to this action should be mailed to:**

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 308-6306, (for formal communications intended for entry)

Or:

(703) 308-6296 (for informal or draft communications, please label

"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington. VA.,

Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Allan Hoosain** whose telephone number is (703) 305-4012. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 7 am to 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Krista Zele**, can be reached on (703) 305-4701.

Art Unit: 2748

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.


Allan Hoosain

Patent Examiner

May 19, 2000